Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting April 17, 2012, Room 317 City Hall

Date of Z&P Meeting: June 7, 2012

ITEM SUMMARY

Description: Item #1, BZH #27287

1101 Nicollet Mall – Peavey Plaza

The City of Minneapolis Public Works Department submitted an application for a Demolition of

Historic Resource to allow for the demolition of Peavey Plaza at 1101 Nicollet Mall.

Action: Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the Heritage Preservation Commission adopted staff

findings, denied the demolition, and directed staff to establish interim protection and have the

Planning Director prepare a designation study of Peavey Plaza at 1101 Nicollet Mall.

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Hanauer: I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Larsen: Questions of staff? Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: Thank you, Mr. Hanauer. I just have two questions to start out. First of all, how did Orchestra Hall come to have the ability to expand into the plaza and the second question is, is that expansion a constant between all the four plans were considered?

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Kelley, I think I will be able to best answer that first question. There is easements between Peavey Plaza and Orchestra Hall. You can see with this plan, that Orchestra Hall's expansion, which is probably best shown by this element here, would extend into the current Peavey Plaza, into this area right here. Commissioner Kelley, would you be willing to repeat your question?

Commissioner Kelley: Yes, I guess I just wanted to know what the ownership ... you mentioned easement, but the mechanism by which Orchestra Hall can just take that additional space that is now public space.

Staff Hanauer: If you could direct that question to the applicant, I think they would be able to better answer that.

Commissioner Kelley: I will, thank you.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Lindberg:

Commissioner Lindberg: Thanks, Aaron, I appreciate your report. I have three questions for you, so probably not the quickest. Looking at your findings, number six says Peavey Plaza requires substantial rehabilitation work. The rebuilding of Peavey Plaza with like-materials and design is estimated at \$8.7 million. And then I was reading through the comment letter that we received from the National Trust Preservation Alliance Minnesota, Preserve Minneapolis, so forth, Cultural Landscape ... and looking at the budget it says that in the 8.7 million there is \$1.8 million in that budget to put granite in Peavey Plaza, but as they pointed out and from my recollection, there is no granite and so I am just wondering where that \$1.8 million came from in the budget. And then the \$250,000 for the

current pavers, so you can kind of see that right below. So it seems like there is an additional \$2 million added in, so I'm kind of wondering if it is really \$6.7 million? So that's my first question.

Chair Larsen: Let's start with that one.

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen and Commissioner Lindberg, with the discrepancy of the \$8.7 million and (cough in audience), I'm going to try to answer your question specifically, but when receiving this information the focus was construction costs alone and I made that point earlier but that is what the comparisons were in the report, ranging from \$4.9 million to \$8.7 million for the four different scenarios. So, to try to answer your question specifically, that is a good point that likely will be better addressed by the applicant.

Commissioner Lindberg: Ok, then my next question is when I read the application by the applicant, it said that the cost of upkeeping the plaza had increased, it wasn't making budget and so forth, but then when I look at the drawings there is a lot more water being used. When you see, kind of like the spray fountain, if you could go back a couple images where you showed Commissioner Kelley where the new addition was, to me that looks like it is going to be a lot more water upkeep and so forth. So what is going to be the added budget to that and how does the applicant, who is paying for that?

Staff Hanauer: Chair Larsen, Commissioner Lindberg, for the water aspect in the application, the applicant points out that when there is an event or when there are repairs that need to be made to the Plaza that impact where water is, it would have to be completely drained and then new water brought into Peavey Plaza. So I believe there would be more sustainable water treatments for systems that would be put in place for the new design.

Chair Larsen: That is something that the applicant might be able to answer.

Commissioner Lindberg: Ok, and I think my third one is probably for the applicant as well. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Alright, I'm sure we might have some more questions later. With that, we will open up the public hearing to the applicant, if you will step forward.

Mike Kennedy: Good afternoon Commissioner Larsen and members of the committee. My name is Mike Kennedy and I am the Director of Transportation, Maintenance and Repair for Minneapolis Public Works. I have been involved with Peavey Plaza since 1991 when I started as a staff engineer in our operations division, later as a street maintenance engineer. Street maintenance division is in operational charge and management overseer of Peavey Plaza and now still currently in my position as director of the same division. Peavey Plaza has been a jewel that we have been very proud of to be able to serve, to be able to take care of. When I started back then, we still had the skinny rink and we were operating a warming house and skate rental there. Since then the plaza has become a major, grown to become even a more major downtown destination for events and it is a very recognizable place on the downtown landscape. Very popular for events and things like that. We have managed for a number of years to be able to keep it up. We had to make some changes in the design or in the original construction in order to support those events and there are some other things that we needed to do to help defer some maintenance or to take care of some things that were causing us some maintenance problems. And for a number of years we had, hopefully, the budget to do it. But the support of the operation and maintenance of Peavey Plaza is funded out of the city's general fund and in the last decade and a half that fund, as most people are aware, has been under extreme financial pressures and we have not been able to keep up with the backlog of deferred maintenance that has come now to a 40-year-old plaza that has pretty much lived out its design life. It was really a joy being a part of that, but now we are working with CPED and Public Works are working together on this project to revitalize and re-energize and modernize Peavey Plaza. We are looking forward to doing that, right now, as Aaron had mentioned, much, some of the infrastructure simply doesn't work, can't be, the pumps for the fountains that have failed, can't be replaced, there is no parts for them, things like that. And our costs for maintenance and operation of the plaza have risen while our funding level in order to do that has compressed. And even though he mentioned that we have had recent budgets of anywhere between, or expenditures between \$100,000 and \$250,000 in the last few years, that is nothing like what we need to give it justice, especially in a plaza that has aged as it has. So we are working together and while we do lament some of the loss of some of Peavey Plaza, we know we also look forward to a revitalization and

modernization of the plaza so that it can meet the current needs of downtown now and into the future. So I appreciate the opportunity to let me speak, and I'm going to turn it over to Beth Grosen from CPED.

Beth Grosen: Chair Larsen and Commissioners, I am Beth Grosen, senior project coordinator in the business development division of CPED. I've been working on the Peavey Plaza redevelopment project since 2010. Goals of this project include revitalizing the plaza for the 21st century in a way that honors Friedberg's design ideas. The new Peavey also should be sustainable, economical to operate, and support income generating opportunities. Peter Brown, consultant to the city, will address the details of our application for demolition permit and will also address answers for the questions you have already raised.

Peter Brown: Chair Larsen, Commissioners, my name is Peter Brown and I've been working as project consultant to the city of Minneapolis on the Peavey Plaza project for about a year and a half and I am here to tell you a little bit about how the project has developed over that time and explain to you why we are seeking a demolition from you today. Before I start I should say I am probably going to cover some, show you some of the same images that Aaron showed you. I also want to start by, I think it would be helpful to answer some of the questions you have already asked, it will clarify some of the other things I am going to say. First of all, Commissioner Kelley ...

Chair Larsen: Can you do me a favor and just bring the microphones a little closer together? Thank you.

Peter Brown: Commissioner Kelley, first of all, the orchestra owns that property and they always have. They own it free and clear and one of the challenges, as you can imagine, is that it is often perceived as part of the large public Peavey Plaza because there isn't a border there, but it is the orchestra's property and they are building an expansion on their property.

Commissioner Kelley: May I ask if that was the original location of the restaurant that was never built?

Peter Brown: Correct, there was a restaurant in the original Peavey Plaza, or of the Orchestra Hall project, back in the early '70s that didn't get completed. As for the hard costs and the soft costs, there have been some math things and letters and in the press ... to be clear, there are about \$2 million in soft costs in this project and on top of that there are construction costs. The current project budget is targeted at about \$8 million in construction, \$2 million in soft costs, and we have a cost estimate back just recently and we are at about \$7.9 million construction. Those four alternatives that I will show you in a moment range from \$4.6 to \$8.7 million in construction costs. So that meant they were \$6.4 and \$10.7 million in construction costs, although to emphasize, the city's approach and the project that the council approved last November was not based only on capital costs, as you can imagine. So, let's see, that should answer I think, as for the granite and the pavers, I don't know what budget you have seen and I just saw that letter this afternoon, so I can't really respond. I don't know that there is that much granite in the project at this point. And as for operating costs, we can talk about that as well. Operating and maintaining 40-year-old systems is more costly and having a new system should be more cost effective to operate.

So as you know, a renowned landscape architect designed Peavey Plaza built in 1974-75. It was designed to fit in an excavated site. There were two buildings, two large buildings on that city block that were demolished and scooped out that left a hole in the ground. When the orchestra's architect designed the orchestra project, they took the hole as an opportunity and they created a lower level with musicians, lounge, and offices facing into that hole and when Paul Friedberg was hired and working for the city they agreed to use that as an opportunity to have a sunken plaza. So that's part of how the design started. You know it is a modern design with incorporating terraces and water and all those things. The plaza was designed before the Americans with Disability Act was passed in the mid-1990s and it is not accessible today yet. It was designed before crime prevention through environmental design principals were developed also, starting in the 1990s. That's the idea of surveillance and increasing perceptions and reality of safety by people being able to see around things. So Peavey Plaza has some corners and some visibility issues that lead to perceptions of safety concerns. And then more generally it is costly to operate and maintain and continues to be more so and Mike Kennedy has just talked to you about that. And generally the materials and the systems are all in poor condition.

The way the project started is that in 2010 the Minnesota Legislature, in its bonding bill, allocated \$16 million to the entire city block. They treated it as one project and they allocated \$14 million to the orchestra expansion and \$2 million to the Peavey Plaza expansion. That started off the city's efforts on the project and in the fall of 2010 Oslund and Associates architects were selected to be the design consultant for the project. At the same time the city's team was put together and that included CPED staff and then a core team that has been meeting basically every twoweeks ever since and that is comprised of the city CPED staff, Oslund & Associates, several representatives of the orchestra, HR&A advisors is an economic consulting firm based in New York City that provides advice to cities on how to design and operate signature urban parks and plazas. They participated in the project with us, and then the major decisions have been taken by a review committee comprised of elected officials and orchestra representatives. So it is a committee of seven and includes the Mayor, Council President Johnson, Councilmembers Goodman and Colvin Roy, State Senator Scott Dibble, and the orchestra's CEO and the orchestra's architect so that we can have our architects working together on the project. At the very beginning of the project we did two things, and one was we interviewed all the people that use and operate and know how the plaza really works so Mike Kennedy and all of his folks, all of the people at the orchestra that use it for events, the Downtown Council that uses it for events, the Downtown Improvement District that is now responsible for Clean and Safe in Nicollet and in downtown. And I think we had something like a dozen or more group meetings and interviews with something like 30 representatives. These are the sort of people who really know how it works and how it doesn't work and try to take care of it. We at the same time did an existing facilities assessment led by the landscape architect and including in that team independent experts in concrete fountains, arborist trees, plan materials, Mortenson Construction participated giving us construction advice as well as cost estimating advice and HR&A giving us advice on economics and operations.

I just want to quick show some images of the real conditions of the plaza. Concrete at the fountains, the left hand picture, and one of the only pictures that show the plaza in the beginning was white concrete, that white has kind of gotten a little bit grayer, but this picture on the left shows how, that's the water line in one of the basins, and that shows how water has worn away the matrix, the finish, on that concrete below, at the water line. Above that you can see the original board form finish the concrete had and you can also begin to see on that picture, as well on the right on the upper picture, how iron-rich water has stained the concrete. And that's the kind of staining that is not really removable. The upper right picture also there has been some jury-rig plumbing done over the years, but more important kind of in the center starting at that step there is crack in the side of that fountain basin. The concrete hardscape is also, these are all materials that are 40 years old, there is falling on the sidewalks on the left, these steps into the plaza, this set of steps has a crack running down it but these steps also aren't ADA compliant. The design of the nosing is too big and too high, so it is a tripping hazard according to ADA. The picture on the right bottom shows some sidewalk settlement and ponding and puddles. In the upper right is a photograph taken underneath. There is some places in the southwest corner of the plaza near the orchestra where there is bridges over the water and this is a picture looking up so you can see where concrete has fallen off and you can see exposed concrete and rusty rebar. Plumbing systems as Aaron and Mike Kennedy both said, two out of three pumps are no longer operational. They are 40-year old pumps and 50-year old technology. Valves that serve the fountains, many of them are rusted shut, some of the pipes supplying the fountains are rusted, the catch basin on the bottom left gives you an idea of the condition of some of the metal piping and plumbing parts of this plaza right now. The center photograph gives you an idea of some more modified plumbing. The fountains originally had that much volume of water running up the pipe and coming out the top. They changed it, put a cap on the top and left a little bit. They pipe up a little bit, fill up the top, and it comes out. So there have been some modifications over the years. On the right hand photograph, for those who have come to think of these pipes as being made of bronze, they are actually made of stainless steel, they've just been stained and etched by water over the years and that is a vandal who has scratched his name into it, that's the real color it should be. The bottom left drawing gives you an idea of how far down Peavey Plaza goes. It is nearly 10 feet from the street level down to the main walking surface and it is almost 11 feet to the bottom of the basin which is sometimes used for events. There is one ramp, it is behind the orchestra hall building and it is not very lovely and is too steep to be ADA accessible.

That bottom right corner is a photograph of the southeast corner of the plaza. There is a sort of a corner up against the orchestra hall building and that is a place where there is quite a bit of nuisance crime and the people who work in that building behind those windows see many more things than they'd like to see happening in the plaza. Peavey Plaza was designed originally as a public park and quickly became a public event space. It is used intensively, as you saw in those early photographs you saw there was more grass. We all know that grass does not survive so well

in urban environments anyhow, but it doesn't really work very well with event spaces. So one of the big challenges Peavey Plaza faces is operations as well as maintenance and infrastructure for event use. So there is not enough power to run the events in Peavey Plaza that happen there all the time, that's why people bring generators. That upper right photograph is a jury rigged junction box that is hidden cleverly underneath a trash can. There's not enough space or accommodation for temporary toilets or trash receptacles when there are events and the plaza is inaccessible and difficult to get equipment down in to because it is stepped and has all these terraces. The city needs to actually get snow removal equipment and gets parts down in there, there is a mechanical room down there where the pumps are, so getting things down into the plaza and back out is difficult. And they tell a complicated story, Mike can tell this better, of how they have to change light bulbs and the lights around the lower parts of the plaza by building ramps with sandbags to get a high reach up, to get a lift up to get over the terraces to get up to the light bulb. So there are some things about the design, physically, that make it difficult to operate the plaza. Aaron already showed you this plan, we went to our consultants and we said if we were to try and make Peavey Plaza code compliant and work in the 21st century in terms of storm water management, in terms of ADA compliance, what would be involved. This is a drawing that shows all the areas that we think would probably have to be explored or damaged or destroyed to make the improvements required. So, getting into those fountains, those pipes are buried underneath those concrete fountains that are stained and discolored and have cracks in them and so by the time you cut into all that concrete and correct those pipes to make those fountains work again, it is going to be half patched and half old. So it is a difficult kind of patching job. The storm water system is not code compliant, storm water drains across Peavey Plaza, down into the basin, and is not filtered, and then goes into the sanitary sewer. That's not legal, we would have to correct that and to do that would involve removing the basin itself, putting in a retention system. There is not a reservoir, so whenever the basin is emptied, 125,000 gallons of water is emptied into the sanitary sewer. As Aaron pointed out, and ADA ramp would be 200-220 feet in length. We thought that the 12th Street side is sort of a less important part of the plaza and if we were to do it, we would do it there. But this was a question of if we were to try and completely keep the design exactly the way it is but we wanted the fountains to work and people in wheelchairs to be able to get into it, what would be involved in it, and this is how much of the site would have to be disturbed.

And last but not least, there are significant economic challenges to the project. We've targeted a capital budget of \$10 million dollars, that's \$8 million in construction costs and \$2 million in soft costs. The state bond proceeds are going to be \$2 million and the city is currently working to raise another \$8 million. Also if not more important, 40-50 years ago, we have learned a lot about how to operate urban plazas. As Mike said, we've been spending \$175,000-\$285,000 a year on operating this existing plaza and maintaining it. The rule of thumb according to our economic advisors on signature parks and urban areas is that you should project about 10% of the capital costs as an annual operating budget. So that, we are working on our operating budget and it is going to be between \$650,000 and \$850,000 or so, but we are targeting \$750,000 right now and if the city were to keep contributing \$250,000 a year, that means we still have \$500,000 more a year we need to earn to operate the plaza the way we'd like to operate ... to operate the plaza in a way that we think is befitting an urban plaza and that includes clean, safe, high quality programming and vital and vibrant plaza. To do that, any revitalized plaza must support income generating activities. Those include events, food, concessions, donations and sponsorships. The point is for both our capital budget and our operating budget we will be seeking funds from private, corporate, and philanthropic funders and the design and the operating model both have to be attractive and compelling to all the funders involved in the project.

To the design process, we asked Landscape Architect to, as you always do in a design, say give us alternatives, please look at everything ranging from restoration to complete replacement so we have an idea of what that means, how the different designs might resolve these issues, and what those costs might be. And there were about 37 design alternatives that were narrowed down to four. The first replacement, we originally called it restoration or preservation, we changed the term to replacement because that is the scheme where basically you have to remove so much of the plaza that you are putting back a facsimile of the original plaza but you are not actually able to preserve enough of it. The hybrid is sort of keeping half, keeping some of the fountain elements and adding in some new design elements. The street grade was you fill the whole thing in with earth and you cover it and make a flat, atgrade plaza, that was the least expensive, that was the \$4.9 million in construction costs. And the commons is the scheme that we have been developing. It is a sunken plaza, not sunken as deeply as the original one, with some of the design elements of the original design, the terracing and stepping. And so those cost estimates, the range on

those four schemes was 4.9 - 8.7 million, the most expensive was the replacement although as I say that is not the only reason we are not looking at that alternative.

So summing up, the project team and the review committee of the city has settled on these goals for Peavey Plaza revitalization project: safe and accessible for all citizens, infrastructure and amenities to support event use, environmentally sustainable in terms of storm water management and economical to operate and maintain, and respect the spatial principals and elements of the original design. The upper right is a sketch that Oslund's office, that Paul Friedberg sketched, when he was working with Tom Oslund about a year ago, showing his ideas of where people came in to the plaza, and with arrows, areas of where there is terrace and where there is grass and where there is a large water basin. The bottom is Oslund & Associates' sketch showing in the same style, the same kind of ideas of where people would come in, but there is a water basin or reflecting pool. It also shows the impact of that major construction of Orchestra Hall, which really does change the way you come in to Peavey Plaza. The features of the design, this commons design that has been approved by City Council, is there is a large reflecting pool, there is a fountain that spills water down and creates some audible, the sound of water splashing, that was an important thing that we heard from a lot of the user group meetings that we attended. There are a variety of spaces large and intimate, and we also provide a food concession, a pergola, kind of a long pergola seating area with loose seating and some grass areas as well. The site plan, the whole upper kind of half of the plaza is at street grade. So you come along Nicollet. Nicollet is at the top, 11th at the right. You enter the plaza and you can kind of come into the plaza and walk down along a boulevard of trees and all of that is at street grade, you don't immediately get to steps and terrace. There is a long pergola that is item D and item E that provides sun shade. There is a lot of, at the noon time, the sun on the plaza is direct so we have had to think about how to provide shaded areas so the people will stay in the plaza when it is sunny. Then there is a stepping ramp that is ADA compliant that carves its way through a series of terraced steps or seating down into the lower basin area which is designed to be reminiscent of the original basin. It is not several feet deep like the first basin, it is a couple of inches deep and drainable to a reservoir so the water can be drained out, the area can be used as an events base, the water can then be pumped back in. And on the left hand end of that there is a feature called the performance wall. It is a combination of mechanical room below for the pumps and all the mechanicals for the systems and above the storage for tables and chairs and some other back of house uses. And that basin area is only 4-feet below street grade rather than 10, so it is much more accessible. And part of ADA is dignified entry and this is, you can now get if you are coming in a wheelchair from 11th which is where many people enter the plaza from, you can go straight down to the plaza rather than having to go back around to 12th Street behind the orchestra hall building. The bottom item J is kind of a lawn area that we have contemplated lawn bowling or some other kinds of activities like that. And then item D, near the top, that looks like the pergola, it is kind of a feature that shows the lines of the pergola as a potential concessions, and that is actually sliding a little bit more towards the center of the block. And you can also see here how the orchestra hall expansion starts to kind of create an end cap for that fountain.

Those are four views...all these design images I'm showing you are the images we showed last fall that city council approved on November 4. The view on the left, the upper left, is looking down from Nicollet and 11th down into the basin, in this case with performance, and the end of the background is that performance wall. If there was not a performance, water would be coming off the top of that down into the basin. The upper right is the tree boulevard that runs from 11th to 12th. Bottom left is looking back from 12th into the reflecting pool basin and you can start to see on the left the stepped, the terraced seating which is meant to be reminiscent of the original terrace seating. In the Friedberg design, it is a little bit far away in this rendering but further in the end in front of the orchestra expansion there is also terracing going up to that building. And bottom right, we endeavored to bring ice-skating back to Peavey Plaza as well.

Just a quick review, this project started out with public outreach and the interviews of the four landscape architecture firms that were finalist, were public, and were held at the convention center in November 2010. The orchestra created a community engagement committee that included nearby residents, nearby business owners, members of the two downtown neighborhood groups, representatives of the city and the orchestra and they have met a half dozen times over the last several years. We've had all the user interviews which I mentioned. Oslund & Associates did an online Survey Monkey, there were 234 responses on what people liked about water versus food and all those kinds of things that we integrated in the design. There were three public open houses, we have presented to the Minneapolis Senior Citizens Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities too.

Those folks get involved in looking at public space in terms of accessibility. The design was unveiled in October 2011 and the renderings went live on the city website. The city received about 100 email responses, they were directed to the city council members who had an opportunity to review them. City council approved the project unanimously November 4, 2011. So to summarize, we are here today to request a demolition permit to realize these goals of making Peavey Plaza a vital and vibrant place again. On behalf of all citizens of Minneapolis. The city hopes to rebuild Peavey Plaza in tandem with the orchestra hall project. As I mentioned these two projects were bonded at the same time with the idea that the whole block could be redeveloped. Orchestra hall's project breaks ground this summer, June/July, and it is going to be 12-15 months. We hope to run in parallel with that as much as we possibly can. Last I want to emphasize that the city team and the staff and team of consultants has explored many options and concluded that this approach best addresses the economic and design challenges confronting Peavey Plaza today.

Chair Larsen: Alright, I'm sure we have some questions for you. So we will start with Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: Before, Mr. Kennedy mentioned that the current plaza had reached the end of its design life and I was curious if anyone had projected a design life for this commons construction.

Peter Brown: No, but I think that generally we think that it is going to be another 30-40 year life. The goal is that it is operated in a way that it is more vibrant and maintained a little more thoughtfully than people thought about these things 30-40 years ago. But capital assets get spent down and have to be replaced. I don't think we assume it will be a hundred year plaza.

Chair Larsen: Ok, Commissioner Haecker.

Commissioner Haecker: I think the question was the maintenance cost, has there been a study what was the historic revenue maybe per year and then what is the projected revenue with the new concession stands and all that?

Peter Brown: Historically the plaza generates no revenue other than permit revenue. The orchestra rents its piece of property for events and they charge rent for that but the city has never really made any money on Peavey Plaza. Downtown Council and other people that run events on the plaza claim to break even on their events, but the city does not collect any revenue. So to this point, there has not been a big bunch of cash flowing into Peavey Plaza to support its operations. The projections are, we are looking at a model where it is about a \$750,000 budget and it includes \$250,000 of operating maintenance from the city, so the same load they have been carrying, with the idea that it will go further because the systems will be new and improved and more efficient. And then on top of that we hope that a concession will generate \$100,000-\$150,000 of net income. We hope to generate another several hundred thousand dollars in revenue from sponsorships and from events and we hope to be able to generate some operating grants from funders of the plaza.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Tableporter.

Commissioner Tableporter: You mentioned the maintenance cost would be about the same for the city, so that is no change. And then you mentioned there will be an uptick in the amount of revenue that is generated. Is there any reason you couldn't generate revenue off the existing plaza. It hasn't been done, but is there any reason it couldn't be added to the existing plaza?

Peter Brown: There is no concession on the existing plaza and the design is difficult. It is a difficult plaza to use in terms of getting events in and out of the plaza. There's not enough power supply to run the events as effectively, so we'd like to be in a position where we can offer better event venue. It will generate a little bit more income.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lackovic.

Commissioner Lackovic: I think you mentioned the inadequate power and some of the other operating costs as being problematic with the existing, but you would have to address those with the existing or with the new. You'd still have to provide for a new system, for the commons park ... improve power. You will still have to connect to

storm, versus sanitary. So a lot of the same costs that are being, that are feeding into the infeasibility of rehabilitation still need to be addressed for the new park. So I guess what I'm wondering is a lot of these things are going to be the same regardless of whether it is a rehabilitation or not, is there, have you done a side by side analysis where things are even. I mean, we have to assume that we are going to tie into the sanitary storm, so that is kind of a wash, maybe. I mean have you done an analysis, I guess maybe that is one thing that I am missing. You've given us a range of costs but we haven't really seen it side by side so that we can see what it really means, how it really impacts.

Peter Brown: We're still working to develop our operating budget. The, we would have a lot of the same costs, we hope to spend the money better. Right now the money is spent on keeping old systems that don't work very well going and fixing things that don't work very well. So you are right, we would have all these costs. We would have to replace all these systems no matter what route we go. But the other goal is to make sure that we are not just kind of patching and going along, but that we are adding to the plaza. We are having some operations and maintenance, will there be more staff involved in curating and programming and bringing more life and more program to the plaza and what are those kinds of costs as well. So I don't have the side by side table fee showing the way we spend the money now versus how we are going to spend it in the future. What we are saying is that we think the city is going to make a similar commitment to the one it has made in the past and there may or may not be the involvement of contract work by, for example, the DID to do Clean and Safe and those kinds of things. But there would then be, we would build up from that the \$250,000 operating and maintenance budget and add to improving programming and providing other kinds of events.

Chair Larsen: Did you look at the, well I guess they are sort of two questions. One is the construction estimates, you talked about leveling the land and making a flat plaza – that would be the cheapest. You talked about the rehabilitation model as being the most expensive. Where did you peg the commons project, what was the construction budget for that?

Peter Brown: Slightly less than \$8 million, so it was kind of in the middle, a tie.

Chair Larsen: Close to the same. Did you look at the, an effective reconstruction of the plaza? So if you are concerned about patching and repairing and in some ways more a wholesale reconstruction of the elements that you would have to alter.

Peter Brown: I think we think that we would end up replacing the entire plaza with an entirely new copy of the original plaza. By the time we were done cutting up the concrete that is rusty and discolored and all the finish is gone, and if you were to try and match that up with new construction it would look not very good. So I think we think it is going to be basically complete replacement of the entire plaza. I should also add that these were conceptual cost estimates, they are about a year old. Our latest cost, there is 4-5% inflation going on right now, so it might have gone up a little bit but they were conceptual and for use looking at decision making.

Chair Larsen: Ok, thank you. Commissioner Faucher.

Commissioner Faucher: This question might be more for staff, I'm not sure. You outlined the process going through with the public hearings and the different things, I'm just curious being new to the commission this year if there has been HPC involvement prior to this. If we reviewed it just to give input like we do so often. No? Ok, just curious. Or what staff involvement, if there has been any staff involvement as far as HPC staff prior to the application being submitted.

Peter Brown: I don't believe so.

Staff Hanauer: Has there been HPC involvement over this time ... we have received letters for concern of the demolition of the plaza, but no application was submitted before February for a Demolition of an Historic Resource.

Commissioner Faucher: Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Mack, did that answer your question? Alright, we may have some questions later, thank you. So the public hearing is open, we will hear from those speaking for and against with a three minute limit. Step forward and state your name and address for the public record.

Charlene Roise: Hi, Chair Larsen, Commissioners ...

Chair Larsen: Could you do me a favor and move those mics closer together.

Charlene Roise: Ok, I don't want to blast you out either ... I'm Charlene Roise with Hess Roise Historical Consultants. We are at 100 N 1st Street in the Warehouse District. I've been interested in Peavey Plaza for a long time. Mr. Hanauer referenced an article I wrote that was published in Landscape Architecture magazine several years ago about the plaza, but I cannot possibly be as articulate about the issues that you are addressing tonight as Charles Birnbaum who has joined us from Washington D.C. Charles wrote most of the guidelines that we use to deal with landscape and he was on the original team that was selected for this design. So I would like to cede my three minutes to Mr. Birnbaum.

Charles Birnbaum: Thank you, Ms. Roise, and thank you commissioners. It is an honor to be here in this incredible building this evening, and thank god for frequent flyer miles. There are two things circulating right now and I will just mention what they are before they come to you. The first is a photograph that was part of my initial involvement with Peavey Plaza in 2008 as part of a traveling exhibition ... (tape gap) ... Associates. Mr. Brown neglected to mention my involvement in the original team with Mr. Friedberg. And Tom Oslund who I am a great fan of and who I consider a very close friend. I am going to share with you the opening salvo that was written in the original RFP response that was presented when we were one of the four teams. This is our cover letter on October 10, 2010: Perspective is required to determine what elements of the original design have sustainable cultural value. Peavey Plaza needs to be the future; however, the new solution should be rooted with respect to its history. To this end, Mr. Birnbaum has consciously recruited to be a partner in our team approach. Mr. Oslund then references in his cover note, my involvement with the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes which are the seminal document of applying the Secretary of the Interior Standards, which I served as the author from 1992-1997. I am here with colleagues and comrades and friends who share a similar set of values and vision. We humbly request the commission today that the city of Minneapolis' application for the Demolition of an Historic Resource currently before you should be denied and the property should be placed under interim protection for a period of 180 days to explore alternatives for demolition.

I'll end with two points. First to speak to Mr. Friedberg who I had the good fortune of serving as an intern for when I was 21 years old during the time he was master planning for Battery Park City Authority, and Minneapolis landscapes like Loring Park and Peavey Plaza were things that I knew from the Mary Tyler Moore show. This image on the cover of Shaping the American Landscape, which was published by the University of Virginia Press in 2009 which during our interview was given to the entire selection committee. It also has a photograph by the same local photographer, also taken in 2008, in all of its glorious patternation. To speak to elaborate on Aaron's suggestions for significance, which I thought were tremendously helpful, first this is, I can say unequivocally as a person with an national perspective and 30 years of experience, the most significant extant work by M. Paul Friedberg in America. It is the sole, early example of the amphitheater and people being a part of the kaleidoscope of life which Larry Halperin himself coined the phrase in his book Cities, and Mr. Friedberg was collaborating with informally, if you will, when he designed the plaza. Second it is the progenitor of the idea of the park plaza. That people say to me, well, that's antiquated, that's from the '70s, what is a park plaza. One only needs to look to Miami today to see the brand new West 8th celebrated project for the Miami Soundscape Symphony Park with Frank Gary, which is, of course, a park plaza. Thirdly, it is a rare surviving example of post-warline architecture. And I know that there are landscape architects here this evening, and some have taken some licks for taking a position, but the question I always ask my friends who are landscape architects is, tell me the examples of those seminal post-war plazas that survive in the U.S. with a high degree of integrity from the '70s to today. You can count them on one hand. And most of them tend to be in California where you have Mellon Square which is undergoing a very thoughtful restoration right now, 10 years earlier. Fourth, arguably this is eligible to the National Register. I would like to go on the record of saying if I was still at the National Park Service, that this is in fact a National Historic Landmark candidate. For those of you unfamiliar, there are about 87,000 National Register properties. Nineteen hundred have

significance in landscape architecture. To date, Mr. Friedberg has none. In terms of National Historic Landmarks, there is only about 2700 and only 60 some that have significance in landscape architecture. And finally the thing that I find most extraordinary as a person who first is in the project sector and then in the public and now in the trenches in the non-profit world where we are looking at bottom up – carrots, not sticks – not Federal policies – but the thing that is remarkable to me unlike other modernist works, this is a landscape that is truly loved and people have extraordinary familiar relationships with.

In closing I'd like to just reference the white paper that you all have before you. I'm not going to take your time today, I've highlighted four passages. The reason that I was brought in as a consultant, and this was basically a couple days of work, was the quest before we put pen to paper, before designers fall in love with their vision, that we come up with overarching principles. Those principles can accommodate ADA. So, for example, we met with the preservation community because in fact the goal of this proposal as articulated in our team's cover letter, this team collectively believes this project should and will become a model on how modern works of landscape architecture are reconfigured. This was the framework for that. Things like raising the plaza 30 inches where on one hand you destroy fabric but on the other hand you maintain design intent. You are still in the plaza below grade, and then you can have a historic and dignified arrival experience.

I want to, in closing, just pose the question by, this is the closing salvo in this white paper: With the aid of these guidelines and recommendations, Peavey Plaza's integrity will be protected, thus ensuring its eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places as a significant work of landscape architecture under Criterion C, the Work of the Master. For those of you that have copies of the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscape, indulge me and look at page 56. Where is the thorough evaluation of alternative solutions that is part of the central hallmark of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. I thank you all for your time today, I turn the floor to my colleagues.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Becky Roloff: Good afternoon, Commissioners and I'm sorry I have my back to the others in the audience, my name is Becky Roloff and I am the president and CEO of the YWCA of Minneapolis. If we had orange color, our building, obviously we are at the corner of 12th and, 11th and Nicollet, in downtown Minneapolis. We were found, I want to do just a little bit of perspective setting on why I am speaking strongly in favor of the proposed plans for Peavey Plaza. We were founded in 1891 in downtown Minneapolis where working girls and women could eat lunch. In 1903 the YWCA built its first building at 80 South 7th Street and was the first building owned by a woman in the State of Minnesota. In 1911 our first capital campaign was to raise \$10,000 to build a swimming pool so girls would have a place to swim year round. In 1927 the capital fund drive raised a million dollars in ten days for a new building which is at our current site. So the corner of 11th and Nicollet has been home, that physical space, to the YWCA since 1929. In 1945 the pool in that location was the first integrated pool in the entire region. In 1974 the 1929 building was demolished. The swimming pool on the upper floors created pools throughout the building and it was better and less expensive to start over and design a building to meet the new needs of the community. For example all of the single rooms that had been appropriate in 1929 were no longer appropriate because women could rent their own apartments. In 1974, as you heard, Orchestra Hall was built and in 1975 Peavey Plaza was built. In 1976 our new building opened in its current home to one of our three early childhood facilities, health and fitness centers and our administrative buildings. The point of this brief walk in history of what has happened on that corner is that we respect the history of Minneapolis and its architecture and we care deeply about what happens to Peavey Plaza. I think a bit of what is facing your decision on Peavey Plaza is what the YWCA faced in the early '70s when they were asked to reimagine the whole space of the building. They had a building that no longer structurally fit the function of what it was intended to do much the same as the water columns no longer work and we don't have accessibility in the Mall. But more importantly I think what has happened since Peavey Plaza was built, is that the community has shown what it needed and the building and the plaza needed to reflect that. An early childhood center was not needed in our building in 1929 but it was needed in 1976 and I give you the example of working women. My office squarely faces Peavey Plaza. I don't know how many people here look at Peavey Plaza 10-12 hours a day, I do. I love Peavey Plaza, I just don't think it works anymore for how the community has shown that they want to use it. There is no better magical summer evening than when the orchestra or bands are playing, food vendors are lined up on the Mall, people are walking everywhere finding places to sit. The sidewalk cafes at the end

of the Mall are magical. And there are people perfectly sober tripping on the many layers of steps. We generally called the ambulance or 911 when somebody dives down the steps. There are cords everywhere from vendors trying to keep the hot stuff hot and the cold stuff cold. There are tables blowing and tipping over if there is even a slight wind. We routinely watch people fall down the steps who turn their head for a moment. If there are more than two people in wheelchairs or walkers, there is no place to go. The water columns on the corner hold things you don't want your children to see ... condoms, cigarette butts and sometimes needles. I think the space and the people who are using it are telling us that the original design served its purpose. It is telling us what it needs to be, even more attractive and more used for what we know now that none of us knew when the plaza was designed and built almost 40 years ago. The hope I have, and I hope it is not a naïve one, is to work together to have this space catch up to its use. And I think that is a challenge. Let's make it accessible, easy to maintain, and practical so that the dream that we have of a vibrant, green space in downtown Minneapolis can be accessible to all. Thank you very much for the time.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Please step forward, state your name and address for the record.

Ken Abdo: My name is Ken Adbo, I live in south Minneapolis, 112 West Minnehaha Parkway in south Minneapolis. I heard a lot of amazing things, I don't usually attend these sort of events, I'm an attorney down in Minneapolis with an office in the IDS Center. I'm actually an entertainment lawyer and I focus mostly on music and I'm a great user of the space not only for myself and my family but my clients who are in the music business use this space. I'm coming forward because, and I have to commend all the presentations, both sides. The argument, they're very good and I don't want to repeat what has been articulated and said already, but I will try to add some other perspective. My perspective is just as a citizen of the city, born and raised here. I've been downtown working since the '70s. I travel a lot, I have an office in New York, a business in L.A. as well as Washington D.C. so I am very familiar with what our reputation is here in Minneapolis. It is a great place where artists develop. It is a place known for great architecture and enlightened education and many great things. In fact most of my friends that come here are surprised it is not buried under snow all year round. So I'm very prideful of our city and I am not going to move. When I see spaces like this with an opportunity to be improved, to really become a showcase, I jump on the opportunity. Primarily because of the music opportunities, the orchestra is so well known, but also as a gathering place. We've heard some great images of how it is a great gathering place and I say ditto to that. And I just want to encourage the city, this was very well thought out, I was very excited about the improvements. And when I heard that there might be a chance that it might go in another direction it burns me out because I think that this is a great opportunity. With all deference to the architects that have been involved in the past, Idon't think that it rises to that iconic level in our city, I just don't. I think it is a great place, but I think it is old. I totally agree that the public has spoken as to how this place should be used. We should listen to that, not listen to the architects who are the past history. It wasn't built for the architects, it was built for us, for the people of the city. It doesn't need to become something that becomes an honorarium to someone who may or may not wish to have it or whatever. I don't mean to denigrate any of the great work that has been put into it in the past, I just think it is pretty clear what the public wants to do with it now and I don't really see it being that incredibly iconic in our city. That said, it is a beautiful space. I know that there is a deference to the prior architects. That is going to be incorporated in this. I think that is very sensitive and great. It seems very generous and very important too, given that it does have its place in our city. I do have disabled relatives, they can't get down in there. I do have bands that can't get their equipment down there easily. I know it harbors unwelcome activity. My kids have been subject to that. It can be improved. It is broken, it is just broken. And I don't know that it can be improved by retrofitting things. I think it can be improved by being prospective in the thinking and to make it a great place that will become a wonderful destination for our city that is actually very magical for many people who visit here, not only our residents. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Ok, please state your name and address for the record.

Marjorie Pitz: My name is Marjorie Pitz and I live in St. Paul and work in Minneapolis. I am a landscape architect and an honorary fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects, which is a title conferred to leaders of the profession. I would like to comment on the budget which contains some clearly erroneous figures. The city stated that Peavey Plaza is too expensive to replace and that the proposed new design is less expensive. This conclusion was reached with clearly erroneous numbers. The cost model that Mortenson Construction produced stating that the replacement scheme contains line items that don't even belong in a replacement solution. Specifically, there are

three line items in that replacement scheme cost model that call for granite veneer. Peavey Plaza has never had granite veneer. They are putting in line items that put granite on the concrete steps, that put granite on the concrete walls, and that change the concrete water features to granite. This is not replacement, this is an erroneous thing that got put into that cost model by Mortenson. If you add up just the granite veneer, it is \$1.8 million that should not be in this budget. In addition, there is another clearly erroneous line item which is a slate paver system on pedestals at the base of the reflecting pool. The existing base of that pond is not on pedestals and it is not slate or stone. So that again is increasing the level of cost beyond what exists there now and is not actually replacement. If you take the granite veneer and the elevated paver system out, that reduces the price for the replacement scheme by \$2 million and brings it down to \$6.7 million. Clearly that is less expensive than the scheme the city is going after right now; however, they are using the cost of replacement to justify that move. So I think that needs further investigation. I've looked at the cost model by Mortenson and I have a few additional observations. One is it is really over simplified. For a plaza of this amount of money there are very few line items in there and they are probably based on vague information and not a fully fleshed out design which is not surprising. I'm also disturbed that the city's process has not been transparent even though they have claimed it has. In fact, only one of the four plans has ever been released to view for people. So when I look at the replacement scheme, I am not able to compare that to a replacement plan. Nobody has a clear idea of what was in these other plans and we are being asked to accept their sum of what the dollars are and that comparison without being able to verify it on our own. I don't think that is transparent. As a curious landscape architect who really loves Peavey Plaza, I attended the public interviews and found that Paul Friedberg and Charles Birnbaum were on the Oslund team. They promised that they would explore a revitalization scheme. Everybody agrees you have to meet ADA rules, you have to meet modern uses for the plaza, so nobody wanted a replacement scheme. Their purpose was to create a revitalization scheme that blended the best of the old with the needs of the new. This was not produced, and no scheme halfway resembling that has been presented to the public. We have only seen one scheme which erases the features of the existing Peavey Plaza. Charles and Paul Friedberg were mysteriously kept off of the design as these were evolving, so that's another example of lack of transparency on the city's part and the need to take some more time to explore the alternatives that this plaza really deserves. I would ask that you delay the permit for demolition, find out where these costs come from, have a chance to review the other plans, and if none of them truly explored the option of revitalizing and keeping the character of Peavey Plaza while investing new resources and technologies and uses into it, then I think that deserves a chance.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Please state your name and address for the record.

Ben Egerman: Ben Egerman, 525 Cedar Avenue South in Minneapolis. I'm speaking to you as a member of the Occupy Minneapolis movement and then also as someone who has a deep love for history and sort of in terms especially of public spaces and architecture and the like. To me this seems like a process that is very emblematic of a city that some decades ago made the choice to systematically demolish most of the buildings downtown. To me, this, like the commenter directly before me, say that it seems like that at no point was the option of preserving historic space actually evaluated. It certainly hasn't been presented. To me, this is, again, what it seems is it is neglect of the actual duty of preserving historic space. And then also of the actual uses of that space. I mean, look at pictures such as the ones we have been presented where you are seeing a lot of pictures of largely desolate Peavey Plaza. I've been spending a lot of time there in the last few weeks and I'll tell you there are plenty of people who are using Peavey Plaza all the time and at no point does it seem like those folks have had their needs evaluated as of what would the new plaza look like and how would it evaluate the needs of the people who are already using it. These people include low income folks and homeless folks, but just people passing through. It seems like the priority has been given to the usage of this space as a venue for events, as a place for commerce, with very little interest given to the impact on people. Fundamentally, my earnest opinion is that public spaces should be for the public. That we are not in need of a space that can be a venue for large concerts or better concerts or more lucrative concerts, but in fact spaces that serve the public. So that is sort of my own take on where this is coming from. And I would also say that there is a part of me that kind of feels like, as a member of Occupy Minneapolis, and I note that this plan was put in motion long before we choose to use Peavey Plaza as a space to occupy, and that being said, I think it is important to note that there are many people there who will be interested in defending the space as it is. And that sort of brings an urgency to it as well. At any rate, I would urge you all to, and actually finally I would say, when presenting the plans that we heard earlier, the words were consistently revitalization, remodeling, or a lot of re words. However, the question before you is whether to issue a demolition permit. The question is whether to demolish a historic site, and I would urge you not to.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Alright, please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Erin Berg: Good evening, I'm Erin Hanafin Berg and I'm the field representative for the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota. Our offices are at 416 Landmark Center in downtown St. Paul. We are a statewide non-profit historic preservation and advocacy and education organization and as many of you may know, in 2008 we listed Peavey Plaza as one of our 10-Most Endangered Historic Places in the state. I wanted to tell you a bit about my background, because I have a lot of empathy for the position that the commission is in and the staff. I have 15 years of preservation, professional preservation experience, and I served for seven years as the staff person for a large group and commission. So I understand the position that you are put in, and this is a very challenging decision, but with all due respect I do want to remind you that the question that is before you tonight is whether or not to approve an application for demolition. Not to approve a new construction. Peavey Plaza is not a designated historic site. What is proposed in its place is somewhat immaterial because the application that is before you tonight and that is supported by your ordinance is whether this is a historic resource and whether it should be allowed to be demolished. I believe that adequate alternatives have not been presented and have not been analyzed. They certainly haven't been presented for the commission's review, unless you were satisfied with what Mr. Brown said about 37 alternatives and 4 design schemes. I sat on the community engagement committee, I was honored to be a part of that, I only saw the four design schemes, and the one that came closest to preservation was the one that was a complete replacement scheme. At no time did we ever see anything that attempted to sensitively rehabilitate Peavey Plaza. As we've heard from experts in the field, that is possible. We believe that it is possible. We believe that all of the issues that staff and the applicant have raised about accessibility and security and economic sustainability ... all of those things could be addressed in a revitalized plaza that retains its historic, most of its historic character, and the challenges allowing that assessment to occur so that we can consider whether that is truly a viable option. We hope that it is. We hope that you will allow another 180 days at least, to consider those options and not approve the demolition of Peavey Plaza today. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Elizabeth Gales: Good evening, my name is Elizabeth Gales. I live at 5709 Lyndale Ave S, #3 in Minneapolis. I've come before this commission before for work. I'm here tonight as a representative of two non-profit organizations: Preserve Minneapolis which advocates for preservation across the entire city, and the Minnesota Chapter of Dokomomo US. Dokomomo is an international organization that is dedicated to the preservation of modern properties. I've been a professional in the historic preservation field for over a decade and I serve as president of both of the boards of the organizations that I represent tonight. On January 13, 2009, I stood before this commission as a representative of Preserve Minneapolis and asked you to prevent the demolition of the Pauline Fjelde house at 3009 Park Avenue. I know some of the commissioners sitting here tonight were present that evening. The owner that night had put forth a demolition application because he wanted to demolish the building to build a surface parking lot. The staff found that his application did not demonstrate that the building was unsafe, and he did not provide reasonable alternatives to its demolition. He argued that he could not keep up the building. That night this commission voted to prevent the demolition and place the building under interim protection while it was studied for historic designation. Tonight you are faced with a similar situation. You have an owner who claims they cannot keep up maintenance of their historic property. And this is a very important historic property. We've heard from CPED staff, we've heard from Landscape Architect who has a national reputation that this property is eligible for the National Register, and it would likely be eligible for local designation as well and is worthy of protection. The owner has put forward a demolition permit with numbers that really are not apples to apples. They don't clearly explain how the cost of replacing and the cost of building the new would be that different. And they do have some questionable items in their budget that frankly when I read it made me distrust the opinion that they had put forward. The owner has not put forward adequate plans showing that there was an alternative to the demolition, in fact according to a Finance & Commerce letter that was cited in the letter that my organization signed on to tonight, they only have \$2 million of \$10 million needed to build. Will they demolish this and then leave a crater on Nicollet Mall while they try to raise the money? Will the commission allow a historic resource to be wiped from the face of the earth because they don't have the money? I feel that their demolition application may not be complete and may not provide the commission with all the information they need. As a representative of Preserve Minneapolis and the Minnesota Chapter of Docomomo U.S. I am asking this commission to deny the demolition permit for Peavey Plaza

and to place the property under interim protection for a period of 180 days so that a historic designation study of the property can be conducted and possibly alternatives to the demolition may be explored.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Alright, state your name and address for the record.

Robert Norris: My name is Robert Norris and I formerly lived at 1225 LaSalle which is right across the street. I'm just a tax payer and citizen, and the reason I came down here is I've been involved in a couple of these things before where you get the flyer in the mail that says we are going to demolish Peavey Plaza or we're going to put in an airport or we are going to do this or we are going to do that, and the meetings are always held at a time which is never convenient to go when you are a citizen. And it is always in the most inconvenient time frame that makes it almost impossible for the average citizen to come in and say something. So I said, you know what, I went on the website and they don't give you much information so I go on the website and I start looking at what is going on and I start reading through and I spent probably an hour out of my day looking at this. Knowing what I know, and I'm in manufacturing, and I look at it and I say that with the kind of money you can spend, you can make a report that anybody will believe. It is a true story that, last time it was an airport in Eden Prairie, that we needed an airport out there, and you know after reading and looking at the assumptions that were made, it was like, ok, we can do anything we want. We can write things down and we can say things, like for instance the piping being bad. Well if you look at the pictures, the piping is like this thick. So I don't know if the pipes are totally cracked or what, but even if they are cracked and they are in concrete, it will probably still carry water through the pipe. The pumps being broken, ok, well, pumps are broken, they can be replaced. And so you look at the total money being spent just in soft costs on this project. Another couple million and you've got an endowment to spend. And at 5% you could spend \$400,000 a year and so the city is saying they don't have money to maintain it but yet they can spend, come up with eight, nine, ten million dollars, and so to me it just seems crazy. I don't understand it. That's just my comment, and the excuses about the concrete being stained, I just look at that and say, hey, you can take and sandblast the concrete, you can put a polymer resin over it, all those things will bring that concrete right back to where it was. You've got stained pipes that are stainless steel. Well, stainless steel will last forever. Again, a little bit of phosphoric acid in the water would probably clean the whole fountain out, and I bet if we go back in the record you will see that is what they did to clean the fountain years ago. Because I've seen it before, and being down there it would be dirty and then suddenly clean, so there are chemicals that they can put in there to clean the fountain. So anyway, that is just my point, I think it is a great space. The volume of water that is moved through there is like unreplaceable. I mean you look at the fountain that they have and there are little spurts of water here and there and it is always replaced with something new that costs more money but doesn't have the same effect. So I would just encourage you to force them to basically come up with the alternatives and look through in detail the maintenance side. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Please step forward and state your name and address for the record.

Graham Sones: Graham Sones, I'm a former resident of Minneapolis, 5324 Clementa Ave SW is my current address in Waverly. I am a former Minneapolis resident but I am past president of the American Society of Landscape Architects Minnesota Chapter and I served 13 years ago during our profession's centennial celebration as Peavey Plaza was recognized for its unique character and strong public space and park-like benefits to Minneapolis. Today Peavey is a Centennial ALSA Medallion recipient and eligible for National Historic Register and at that point in 1999 the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 had been responsible for many changes in existing current and historic facilities all over the country. And now accessibility and challenge level within the levels of the definition of access to all, especially as it relates to parks, have evolved thanks in part to Landscape Architects allowing historic facilities and parks to overcome more barriers. Peavey is caught in limbo at the moment. Not yet accessible enough to satisfy a future demand, but within guidelines enough to survive. But accessibility I don't believe is the reason Peavey is threatened today. It appears to be a problem Oslund & Associates has the ability to solve and the argument of whether or not it destroys the character of the original design is somewhat subjective but clearly dependent on how the access solution is conceived and presented. There should be several solutions in the process of deciding that kind of impact and then M.Paul Friedberg is willing to help solve this issue. Greater programming needs, increased capacity, and other issues that prompt our decisions to impact the park plaza are tough questions for preservationists and commissions such as this one. Tackling those tough issues is why spaces such as Peavey Plaza still exist today. As a landmark, Peavey Plaza is worth saving because it is a Modernist design statement and is reoccurring along the pedestrian corridor to Loring and those spaces will now be at risk if not weakened by destroying Peavey. Let's

embrace the history of Peavey, not by mitigating it but by preserving it for all and renewing its quality of experience. This is an opportunity to change the actual park in a way that preserves its experience for the better, not to destroy it. What will the next Peavey Plaza be like to experience if it is not the actual place anymore. Perhaps the next park plaza will be nothing like it because Peavey has more history and time-honored success celebrating its spaces. And by tackling the tough issues, preserving the quality and demonstrating how it is achieved, Peavey Plaza park will remain. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Edna Brazitis: Good evening, my name is Edna Brazitis and I am here for Friends of the Riverfront which is a nonprofit whose mission is to protect and preserve the cultural and natural resources of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District. I am here today because when I read the materials regarding the application, the precedent of doing what the city asks really truly frightened me. Of all the things the commission reviews, the demolition permit is the one needing the most scrutiny. There is no going back, when it is gone, it is gone. In this case, the applicant is the city and the city is supposed to have strong values in historic preservation. So at the time they come forward to this commission, what I expected to see was the best application I've ever seen in my life with really documented reasons and a good and thorough and understandable description of all the alternatives and what would work and what wouldn't work, so we could have a good discussion. I was really shocked, because the reason in the application basically is that the donors would really like to see something else here. And if you approve this and somebody comes forward with a historic building and they just say well it is workable, yes, you know, but I'd like to tear it down because if I build a 50-story building or something, I could get more income from it. Or you know, I will have less maintenance costs at the beginning. You'll be faced with those decisions, and some developers will come here and challenge you and say how can you turn down my project when you've approved that Peavey Plaza, because I can't see any reasons in there that justify doing this. And when I looked at this project, I had to go back to my little house, which is historic, and most of us who have worked on historic buildings know that you pay for them on the installment plan. This is the first time, very few buildings get fixed all at once, and so one thing that hasn't been explored is they have \$2 million from the State, how much can you do with \$2 million? What could you fix? We have a gentleman here who is more hands on, and he could tell you there are ways you could fix this, that the public would still love it, to revitalize it that won't maybe cost an arm and a leg. And why am I really kind of concerned so much about this precedent is one of the things that the HPC has done over this last 7 years is really focused on cultural landscapes. You are going to hear from Brian Schaffer a little later about the new guidelines for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and he is going to tell you about cultural landscapes. At the meeting on the A-Mill, you voted to preserve the cultural landscape that surrounded that property and that made me very happy. But these cultural landscapes are really at risk, and many of them are owned by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. And why they are at risk is because they often have vacant space and a person, however well meaning they are, feel that they can fill up that vacant space with something. And what I am really concerned about is how is the city going to be telling the Park Board that they can't put something really stupid, and ruin one of our great cultural and historic landscapes because the city destroyed one. The city is asking to destroy something that is worthy of landmark status in this case. And this isn't just a speculative thing. The Park Board has two projects right now that are being driven by donors. And one of them that I participated in is the Waterworks project in St. Anthony Falls Historic District. And what happened, as with any donor, you are giving money and you just really hope that you are going to really influence it and it will be what you want. But what happened there is the Park Board was really willing to listen to input from all kinds of people. And because of that I think we have a better project that used the historic resources as part of the adventure. So I am going to close by saying findings, delete six and seven. The numbers are under question and you don't want to authorize destroying this, and then what I hope you do is listen to the people who has testified before and 1) deny the request for demolition and do a designation study and 2) look at alternatives because I believe there is a way to revitalize this and save it. Thank you so much.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Trish Brock: Chair Larsen and commissioners, I am Trish Brock, I live at 1801 1 st Ave S, #34 in Minneapolis. My organization "Save Peavey Plaza" was founded in November to enlighten the public because the outreach on this has been woefully inadequate. The mayor himself states in his letter to the city that 500 people participated in this decision making process. That's 500 people out of the entire population of Minneapolis, out of the entire State of

Minnesota, and that does not even begin to address the visitors who come to Peavey Plaza from our convention center. So Peavey Plaza is in my neighborhood. My neighborhood is not in the 7th ward, but I am as close or closer to Peavey Plaza than the people in that ward. Peavey Plaza is in everyone's neighborhood, because it is downtown and downtown really does belong to everyone. We haven't seen in a presentation tonight the giant television screen that they are planning on putting right in the viewpoint of the church, which is a historic structure. We haven't seen that. Everyone is seriously hung up on the disability issue and getting the ramp down. Friedberg, the original architect, has proposed an elevator. Let's bring it into this century, let's do what we need to do with this original Peavey Plaza. Thousands of people have been coming downtown to their plaza annually for the Blues and Jazz festival that goes on there. It is an ongoing tradition. These thousands of people will no longer come to downtown Minneapolis for their festival. The sense is that Peavey Plaza, which will no longer be Peavey Plaza, will no longer belong to the people. It will belong to Orchestra Hall. Two million dollars of the people's money, state money, is going into this project. I've spoken with the governor's policy advisor, I've spoken with House Representative Clark. No one in the legislature was aware when they designated this funding that the original Peavey Plaza was actually going to be destroyed. They thought the money was going into some sort of restoration or revitalization of Peavey Plaza. By giving this \$2 million of the people's money to this project, the legislature and the governor never intended that the original Peavey Plaza would be touched or altered or destroyed. I love Peavey Plaza, and everyone I know loves it, and everyone that they know loves it as well. We have something beautiful and special that is unique to Minneapolis. No one else in the world has anything else that even comes close to what this is. It is nationally recognized and acclaimed. People want it to remain. The City of Minneapolis was entrusted to take care of it. They were entrusted to take care of this. The decision to destroy Peavey Plaza is irredeemable. Once this treasure is gone, it is gone forever and it will be noticeably be gone. Another thing about the new, the water, I was at one of the original meetings for the public and the people who live right near by there cited the water feature as one of the most important features as far as subduing noise from the city and making it livable for them ... so the television screen is going to have kind of an opposite effect to that. Ok, the people do not want that. They do not really want the destruction of Peavey Plaza. There is an alternative. Revitalization of the existing plaza is a better option than demolition which is presently on the table. Please do not destroy our Peavey Plaza. Please put more thought into this so that we do not loose this irreplaceable classic identified cultural landscape. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. State your name and address for the record.

Andrew Hestness: My name is Andrew Hestness and I live at 3932 18th Avenue S in Minneapolis. I was born in Minneapolis, grew up in Minneapolis, and have been visiting Peavey Plaza my entire life. I absolutely love this space. I think it is pretty tragic that we are here today and having a conversation about destroying one of our city's landmark spaces. I'm very disturbed about that and I just kind of want to speak to you all as the stewards of our landscapes. I really hope you take that decision and think about it because I think this space, as others have said, we can't go back if it is destroyed. We have national experts saying that there are ways to bring this back and to sensitively restore it. I think we really need to explore that. The city itself says it is historic. We should be preserving our history if we can keep it viable, so I really just want to encourage you to look at those options and please think about that as you are making your decision. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Sam Richards: Hi, I am Sam Richards and I live at 612 E 16th Street but lately I've been at 1101 Nicollet Mall, which is Peavey Plaza. I'm here with Occupy Minneapolis, some members of Occupy Minneapolis, but mostly in solidarity with the many homeless people that are too busy with survival to be able to speak here right now. I've heard no plan or any consideration whatsoever in regards to the homeless population that this project will displace. Peavey Plaza is a refuge, it is even somewhat from what I've heard speaking with them, there is sort of an unspoken agreement with law enforcement that they will not be messed with there if they maintain good behavior. It is a refuge especially when shelters are too full or simply unwilling to take in any more people. So as usual, we see the victims of our economy getting tossed aside without any care of thought given. The city has many anti-homeless ordinances attacking the human inhabitants of our city on the daily and one that comes to mind is 244.60 which bans people from even sleeping in boxes on the street, anywhere in the city. So Peavey Plaza, having a lot of different structures protecting from all sorts of elements, it would be a shame to see that go away. It is a tiny lifeline that people vitally need. And even when it is just a small number of people, it makes a huge difference. I would be

willing to venture that no one involved in this project from the start, especially the developers, have spent any amount of time with the people that will actually be affecting from 12-15 months. And the last thing that I notice during this presentation today too is that an overwhelming 230 people taking a really leading survey is being cited as public support for the project, and I see that as just frankly quite alarming. So, thank you for your time.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Eddie Krakhmalnikov: Hi, my name is Eddie Krakhmalnikov and I live at 323 77th Street SE, Minneapolis, just north of the river. I am a Masters of Landscape Architecture student at the U and also co-teach the landscape architecture history course, the recitation portion. And I want to briefly mention a conversation that some of my colleagues and I had about a week ago. What is often forgotten is that landscape architecture is a form of art. When other forms of art become aged, they are cautiously fixed. But they are not drawn over. To draw over, say a Stravinski, or whoever, that is absurd, right? So if we look at landscape architecture as an art, it becomes more than just places we walk, just places we sit. It becomes who we are as a city and as a society. So as a future practitioner and as a current student, I cannot in all consciousness be for demolition of this property. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you. Just a reminder for all of you that have spoken, there is a sign-up sheet on the outside and sort of prompted by my inability to understand completely the spelling or how to pronounce your name. So as you leave her tonight, or as you take a moment, please do sign in outside on the sign-in sheet so we have your proper information for the record.

Stewart Higgins: Hi, my name is Stewart Higgins and I am a resident of Minneapolis. Mostly what I own is the Lafayette Building, Brits Pub and Vincent, all 11th and Nicollet right opposite Peavey Plaza. I can't speak to the architectural merits of Peavey Plaza but what I can speak to is my views of being a neighbor for twenty years. It was interesting to hear earlier, a gentleman that mentioned that we didn't need another event space and we didn't need some things for greater concerts. Well in my view, that really is what Peavey Plaza has become. I mean there is very little use of Peavey Plaza other than events. If you take a stroll down Nicollet Mall on a summer's day you will pass lots of outdoor cafes, lots of activity on the streets, and oftentimes, I hope you come to the south end of Nicollet Mall, but if you do get up there you will find that oftentimes Peavey Plaza is relatively empty. It seems incongruous that on a summer's day you will have more people inside in the Crystal Court than you do out on Peavey Plaza. The events that do take place on Peavey Place all seem to be focused on the north end of the plaza. The further you get to the south and the further you get into the plaza, it is used less and less. You know, the last few weeks, a gentleman mentioned Occupy Minneapolis, there has been a noticeable activity in the plaza that generally you don't get unless there is an event there. It seems to me that the Plaza itself is completely disconnected from the city. If there is not an event there, there are very few people in the plaza. At night and during the winter, it is actually a pretty (?). Becky mentioned earlier about some of the activities there. There isn't a physical barrier separating Peavey Plaza from the Nicollet Mall or the rest of downtown, but sometimes it seems like there is. People take the long way to walk around. They cross the street to our side of the street just to walk the block between 11th and 12th Street. So the idea, and may I also add that there has been a lot of discussion about maintenance and clearly that the Plaza doesn't look like it did, well, I can only speak to 20 years ago when we started, but the issues that I'm talking about really haven't changed in the 20 years that we've been here. The events are really good on a commercial level, the events are great for us. But frankly, spending a lot of time looking over a bleak desolate scene, that really is not used by the general public, is not enjoyed on a general basis for people just to go and sit out, is a bit dispiriting. I do strongly support the redevelopment plans, and primarily because they tackle just what I've been talking about and what my views are. We need a kind of integrating space that people will use, that obviously is going to host events and offer a lot of potential to do that, but that will actually draw people in, that will actually allow people to use this space on their lunchtimes and weekends. I mean I would encourage all of the people to come down on a daily basis, during the winter, to come down in the evenings and just see how many people are in the plaza. If there isn't an event on. The plaza is deserted most of the time. So as I say, I strongly support the redevelopment plans. I think that it provides something that does connect Peavey Plaza to the rest of downtown and the Nicollet Mall. So, thanks very much.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Paul Hannemann: I think I'll slouch just a little bit ... good evening members of the commission, my name is Paul Hannemann and I am a resident of 2317 Valentine Avenue in St. Paul. I've worked in downtown Minneapolis for many years and am a frequent visitor of Peavey Plaza, eating my lunch there and enjoying the peacefulness that happens when there isn't an event going on. The applicant has framed their proposal to demolish Peavey Plaza as though this is an either/or question where they must clean every bit of patina and sign of age off of the plaza and return it to its original state or demolish the whole thing and build new. To me, the reason for this framing is clear. It is framed this way because you want a certain result and I think, my opinion is in this case, the desired result is to demolish and make way for a larger performance space for the orchestra. I believe there is a solution that keeps the key signature elements of the plaza and provides the orchestra with a bit more of what they want at the same time. That solution needs to be explored and it hasn't been. The applicant says that the new design is something of an homage to the old design. Homage by wrecking ball is not the answer here. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Margaret: My name is Margaret and I live in south Minneapolis.

Chair Larsen: Margaret, what is your last name?

Margaret: I'm not giving my last name, I'm also a member of Occupy and in the last few weeks I've become intimately knowledgeable about the problems and advantages of Peavey Plaza. Looking at the designs and people are telling us they are going to have to dig down and destroy most of the plaza, if they are going to dig up all that space to replace the water pipes, they could lay down new power at the same time and provide power for their vendors and other people to use. If they are going to build an ADA ramp, they could widen that out and make it useful for the snow removal vehicles and for the concession trucks to get down there and it would also make a really great skates board ramp. People have said that the plaza is often not being used, part of the reason it is not being used is because there are no bathrooms down there. While we were down there, a couple of young women came down there to eat their lunch and they decided to look for a place that wasn't occupied, neutral territory, so to speak. But they were able to go back to their offices afterwards and use the facilities there. There are no facilities at Peavey Plaza and most of the surrounding vendors do not wish to share their facilities with people who are not customers. The city thinks it is being clever by not providing these facilities, but the actual result is that some of the men pee in the reflecting pool and then are horrified the next day when they find out that small children are wading on the water and they regret their actions of the night before. The person who was talking about a public/private partnership often these public/private partnerships involve selling the naming rights, so I am expecting to hear that Peavey Plaza has now become Wells Fargo Plaza or TCF Bank Plaza. You should ask yourself how that sounds to you. A noisy fountain has been provided to provide some ambience. If you are going to have musical events there, a noisy fountain there would not be an amenity. They are talking about putting up a tv screen, I can only think that the tv screen will eventually be used to put up commercials like they have on Hennepin Avenue and it further commercializes the area. This underscores the opinion of many people that the purpose of the downtown area is commercial exploitation. If you are making money or selling something, or if you are buying something, you are welcome. But if you are just down there and you are not spending money, nobody wants you around. So the idea that citizens might just like to hang out in the park and eat their lunch or that they might be down there protesting or doing their civic duty is not an idea that the city council seems to want to encourage. Which is another reason we don't have bathrooms down there, because they don't really want people down there. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you.

Todd Grover: Hello, my name is Todd Grover from 3442 43rd Avenue S in Minneapolis. Good evening, commissioners. I am an architect in a historic preservation firm and I know a number of people up there. I actually was on the HPC for a number of years, so I get very few opportunities to be on this side. But I wanted to take the opportunity tonight ... there has been a lot been said about some of the issues with the application. I'm not going to touch on that, I just want to briefly say that along with Liz Gales have conducted tours of downtown Minneapolis, focusing on the modern architecture of Minneapolis and the heritage that we have. And this is a heritage that isn't quite to the forefront yet, but Liz and I have given this tour on a number of different occasions starting with the National Trust for Historic Preservation when they were here for their national conference. Overwhelmingly after

we give this tour and stopping off at Peavey Plaza being one of the highlights of this tour, people have been amazed. These are people from out on the east coast, out on the west coast, people from around the country and even people from the suburbs saying I didn't know these things existed. I didn't know the significance of these things. Peavey Plaza is one of these things that we highlight on this tour. People, we, Liz and I have deliberately when we have brought people into Peavey Plaza, let them sit for just a second because it is this difference between coming from Nicollet Mall. Some of the activity that we have from the street, and there is a sense of a respite that is in this plaza and it is the significance as we describe this to them about what this piece of landscape architecture really portrays within this realm of this modern architecture heritage that we do have in Minneapolis. And it is going to be very unfortunate if this demolition goes forward, so I encourage you from locally, the people you have heard here, and also nationally, people are aware of this and people see this piece, this jewel, that is part of our heritage that we have here and I encourage you to preserve it. Thank you.

Chair Larsen: Thank you, alright, is there anybody else that wishes to speak either for or against this application, please step forward. Ok, so we are going to close the public hearing. What that means is we are going to deliberate up here amongst ourselves and so we will be talking amongst ourselves and if we see fit we may ask either staff or the applicant to come forward for additional questions and we will have a decision when we are done. Alright, Commissioners, thoughts? Commissioner Tableporter.

Commissioner Tableporter: I would just like to take a second to try to frame the discussion maybe a bit because it seemed like we started the day, or this discussion trying to determine if there was no reasonable alternative based on the cost and functionality ... (gap due to tape switch) ... go to interim protection and a designation study, and also think about whether there is a preservation scheme that makes sense. And then we get back to the issue where we started today of side-by-side costs and functionality. Once we have a preservation option, then we need to determine if it is absolutely infeasible. And that to me seems like a process that makes sense, given our roles. And just personally, I've worked in London for twelve years and if every time a new project came in that said we like a shiny new idea and it is more functional, you can imagine what London might have looked like. So I think that we need to be very careful about our historic resources and actually what our role is. I don't know if the rest of you would agree.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Lindberg.

Commissioner Lindberg: I concur with Commissioner Tableporter and I think our first job is really to say is this a historic resource and when I look at the report and the findings, the first finding, number one, says Peavey Plaza is a historic resource. So I think it is fair, and I'm not starting or beginning a motion, but I think it is fair to put it out for the Commission if we did direct the Planning Director to have a study and direct a planning study, but I don't know if it is feasible to ask, maybe we could also ask that a third party execute the study, just because it seems, many times if it can be a third party it will remove a lot of emotion so it is not, you know, the city executing its own study. And everybody can look at that group and say, hey, it looks great. So I guess that would be my idea, to say the city already said it is a historic resource so that is my thoughts.

Chair Larsen: Alright. Commissioner Haecker.

Commissioner Haecker: I would echo what has been said and I think it does really come down to an issue, you know, is this a historic resource that deserves interim protection and is a candidate for historic designation. The report lists a few items, we've had many testimonies that strengthens that, and I don't think that the proposed design is not a great idea. It has a lot of the same intent and function of what Peavey Plaza is now or was originally designed to be, but it is not really a design, sort of design critique or decision of what is a better thing. I think our role is, is it a historic resource and does it need interim protection and should we direct the city to do a historic designation study. Thanks.

Chair Larsen: Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: I have a lot of sympathy with the city's position. Peavey Plaza is clearly deteriorated and a lot of its faults are probably holding it back from being as good as it could be and being as popular as it could be.

Certainly the ADA drawbacks, the safety drawbacks, the buried plumbing, they are all very compelling. But I tend to agree with my colleagues who have stated that our first question is, is this a historic resource even though it is 38 years old, I think that we have clearly seen that it is a historic resource, an important one, and even perhaps more important, it is a beloved one. And considered almost iconic for this city. So I don't know if everyone has spoken their peace but let me make a motion here that the HPC adopt staff findings 1-5 and approved, sorry, deny the demolition of Peavey Plaza, place it under interim protection, and direct the Planning Director to prepare a designation study.

Chair Larsen: Ok, so we have a motion on the floor. Is there a second to the motion?

Commissioner R. Mack: Second.

Commissioner Lindberg: (unclear)

Chair Larsen: Findings are not specific to the motion. Ok, so Commissioner Mack, Robert Mack, has seconded it. I think we have further discussion, so Commissioner Hunter Weir.

Commissioner Hunter Weir: I am sure I am going to support the motion. One of the things, I don't have any issue with the property being historic and whenever I have a difficult time making up my mind it is because I don't have enough information. For me, that is the financial piece of this. There is no financial alternative. The one concern that I have about historic or not, it is an accessibility nightmare. It is terrible and that needs to be addressed in some fashion. That's just my thought. If you've been down there with someone who has a mobility impairment, this is just not a workable space. And the alternatives too often, one of the things that I think, one of the most impressive things that I've heard since being on the commission with folks from the American Swedish Institute when they talked about what accessibility means in Sweden and it is not second class, it is not an alternative, it is the same access as other people have and that needs to be built in. So, that's my concern.

Chair Larsen: Other comments? Commissioner Kelley.

Commissioner Kelley: Yes, I would agree with that. Accessibility is one of the biggest drawbacks that we are facing with this. The reason I think that it is a good move to put it under interim protection so that then it will have the protections that are normally accorded to historic properties, many of which we have coming back in here to have modifications for things to make them useful for today. Peavey Plaza also needs modifications to make it useful today, to make it useful to the future. We'll be able to work those out now in context with the guidelines, to be able to apply our usual high standards to it and find something that will be, honor the history of the plaza and make it a vital place going forward.

Chair Larsen: Alright, I just have a couple thoughts myself. I think it is interesting we've heard 19 people speak and we have talked about the plaza and the importance of the plaza and the fact that it is called Peavey Plaza. So, in fact, when it was created it very well could have been Target Plaza because Peavey was a company, just like Target, just like General Mills or anything else, so it actually is named after its benefactor. But we have kind of lost that over time. And I think what is interesting about that is that we look at the plaza and we want a place to gather. It is something that we have come to expect. Interestingly enough, that is actually what they are proposing. A place to continue to gather and so that isn't changing. We look at, someone even mentioned the homeless and the people having lunch or the people peeing in the fountain ... any new plaza, any revitalized plaza, that's going to happen. So in that sense, we're not, if we are altering the cultural landscape by changing the design, are we really changing the cultural landscape if we continue to have a plaza, if we continue to have those same issues. Sure, we can have more power, we can have more water, we can have more concerts and things like that, so then it really kind of comes down to is it then really about the design. Is it really about the design itself. Is it about the architect. If this was an historic building designed by a famous architect which we have nominated and designated in the past, then we would be looking at what modifications are possible within that to preserve the character of what that architect was intending. So we have often allowed changes to that design to encourage the rehabilitation of that property. And so in some ways that is what is being proposed here. Is it being, is it the best proposal? Maybe, maybe not. And so I think as we look at what happens going forward, I think we just need to keep that in mind. People talk about saving

Peavey Plaza, but in the end I really do wonder do they really want it exactly as it is today, because in some ways that is what preservation ... you, know, the true "P" in preservation is it is preserving it as it is today. You can refurbish it, you can finish it, fix it back up, and you can make it exactly as it was. But in the end, times have changed and so even the advocates are talking about modifications that can be made. So it is an interesting balance between what is being done and what is being proposed and so there might be a balance somewhere between. One of the strongest arguments I heard in some ways was the discussion that it was a piece of art. And we look at the Pillsbury A-Mill and we talk about the work that is going to be done to restore that building and the care that is being given in terms of restoring that building. Making modifications and making it useful again. And so in that sense it is being done under the care and guidance of the commission and whether we are the best one to do that, I won't answer that question. But as we look forward there is an opportunity to come forward with an additional application. So while the designation study is being conducted, if indeed this motion does pass, then the opportunity that is afforded under interim protection, and during interim protection, the applicant can come forward with a plan that they think meets the guidance. And it could be the same plan, it could be a different plan, but that is their option and we would look at that with the same scrutiny that we've given other historic treatments. So, alright, any further discussion? Seeing none, we will call the roll.

Roll Call Vote

Aye: Lackovic, Hunter Weir, Tableporter, Lindberg, Kelley, Faucher, R. Mack, and Haecker

Nay: Chair Larsen

Abstain: None Absent: L. Mack